

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claim 1 is amended to recite that “pulse width of the output signal O is modulated in accordance with the threshold signal T being proportional to the amplitude of the input RF signal I.” These changes are based at least on FIG. 2 and the accompanying description on page 15, lines 11-15 of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claims 9 and 10 are amended to clarify the invention. Thus, no new subject matter is added.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-10, 15-20, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide).

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sokal in view of Ide as herein amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Sokal and Ide does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claim 1, as amended. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites that “pulse width of the output signal O is produced by the threshold signal T being proportional to the amplitude of the input RF signal I, such that the output signal O is pulse width modulated in accordance with the amplitude of the input RF signal I” as

amended, which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Sokal and Ide. Since the combination of Sokal and Ide fails to disclose Applicant's claimed invention as claimed in independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a). Applicant requests that claim 1 now be passed to allowance.

The Office Action on page 4 states that Sokal does not disclose a threshold signal. However, the Office Action cites Ide as disclosing a threshold signal. Applicant would like to bring the Examiner's attention to the fact that although Ide discloses a threshold signal, it does not disclose that "pulse width of the output signal O is produced by the threshold signal T being proportional to the amplitude of the input RF signal I, such that the output signal O is pulse width modulated in accordance with the amplitude of the input RF signal I." Ide uses a threshold to maintain a constant pulse width. As described in col. 30, lines 58- col. 31 lines 1-2, of Ide in conjunction with FIGs. 17(a) and 17(b)... "[h]ence, even when a threshold T determined by a peak value P and a bottom value Bcauses little variation in the pulse width in the output of the amplifier circuit." Since the combination of Sokal and Ide do not teach or suggest the claim limitation of "pulse width of the output signal O is produced by the threshold signal T..." as recited by independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 103(a).

Dependent claims 3-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claim 2-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 are not obvious in view of the combination of Sokal and Ide and therefore that the rejection of claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1-10, 15-20, 22 and 24 now be passed to allowance.

Rejection of Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide) and in further view of US 4,803,440 (Hotta).

Dependent claims 11-14 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 11-14 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 3,900,823 (Sokal) in view of US 5,955,921 (Ide) and in further view of US 5,625,322 (Gourgue).

Dependent claims 21 and 23 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 21 and 23 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant has reviewed the other references of record and believes that Applicant's claimed invention is patentably distinct and nonobvious over each reference taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

February 18, 2008

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01 – 3rd Floor
Schaumburg, Illinois 60196

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Barbara R. Doutre/

Barbara R. Doutre

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 39,505

Tel. No. 954-723-6449

Fax No. 847-576-3750

Email: docketing.schaumburg@motorola.com